UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,218	01/02/2004	James Edwin Hanson	00280752AA	6661

30743   7590   12/13/2007
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON & COOK, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER
WON, MICHAEL YOUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/750,218	HANSON ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Michael Y. Won	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 October 2007*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the amendment filed October 31, 2007.

2.   Claims 1-16 have been examined and are pending with this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being

anticipated by Lemon et al. (US 2002/0188666).

4.   Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Lemon et al. (US 2002/0188666).

INDEPENDENT:

As per **claim 1**, Lemon teaches a system for enabling human users to interact

with conversation-enabled applications installed at a remote location, said conversation-

enabled applications implementing a conversation policy, the system comprising:

conversation support means (see page 2, [0023]: "a mechanism provides for a conversation controller") communicating with a human-usable interface installed on a user device to support the user's side of a conversation with the conversation-enabled applications (see page 2, [0027]: "validate that each message is of an appropriate input document type for the current state of the conversation" and page 4, [0049]: "conversation controller 300 manages a message on behalf of a service 370");

presentation support means communicating with the human-usable interface installed on the user device to show the user a state of the conversation (see page 2, [0026]: "invoke appropriate... client entry points... and prompt for valid input document types for a given state of a conversation") and options for selection by the user (see page 3, [0034]: "prompting the client for valid input documents" and page 4, [0052]: "may return the message back to the client 360 and prompt"); and

data input means installed on the user device by which the user selects an available option and fills in message content that conforms with the conversation policy in use by the conversation-enabled applications (see page 4, [0051]-[0052]: "produces a valid document for the new state, the client interaction handler 350 may forward the message back").

As per **claim 10**, Lemon teaches a method for enabling human users to interact with conversation-enabled applications installed at a remote location, said interaction being by means of a user device having an installed human-usable interface and said conversation-enabled applications implementing a conversation policy, the method comprising the steps of:

loading a selected service device, said service including a policy archive and a

presentation archive (see page 5, [0056]: "may execute information... received from the

Internet or other networks" and [0057]: "these aspects of an implementation consistent

with the present invention are described as being stored in memory... or read from

other types");

installing a conversation policy supporting the selected service (see page 2,

[0023]: "a mechanism provides for a conversation controller");

accessing the policy archive (see page 2, [0022]: "conversation policy, may be a

formal description of a set of "legal" message type-based conversations supported by a

service") and communicating with the human-usable interface installed on the user

device to support the user's side of a conversation with the conversation-enabled

applications (see page 2, [0027]: "validate that each message is of an appropriate input

document type for the current state of the conversation");

accessing the presentation archive and communicating with the human-usable

interface installed on the user device to show the user a state of the conversation (see

page 2, [0026]: "invoke appropriate... client entry points... and prompt for valid input

document types for a given state of a conversation") and options for selection by the

user (see page 3, [0034]: "prompting the client for valid input documents" and page 4,

[0052]: "may return the message back to the client 360 and prompt"); and

prompting user to select an available option and fill in message content that

conforms with the conversation policy in use by the conversation-enabled applications

(see page 2, [0026]: "may also invoke appropriate services and/or client entry points

based on dispatch service description language specifications and prompt for valid input

document types for a given state of a conversation").

DEPENDENT:

As per **claim 2**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein in the

conversation support means and the presentation support means are installed on the

user device (see Fig.6).

As per **claim 3**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein the

conversation supports means and the presentation support means are installed on a

remote machine, which communicates with the user device (see Fig.3).

As per **claim 5**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein the

data input means prompts the user for decisions (see page 4, [0052]: "prompts for next

legal input document") and then generates a corresponding screen flow for data input

and transforms entered data into a format suitable for delivery to the remote location

(see page 1, [0013]: "An embodiment of the mechanism may also apply a

transformation to output documents" and page 3, [0034]: "apply requested

transformation").

As per **claim 6**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein, said

presentation support means includes an archive of presentation policies accessed to

render messages for the user (see page 2, [0028]: "current state, may need to be

tracked").

As per **claim 8**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein the

user device is a personal computer (see Fig.6).

As per **claim 9**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon further teaches wherein said

presentation support is obtained from another system (see Fig.3).

As per **claim 11**, which depends on claim 10, Lemon further teaches wherein the

policy archive and presentation archive are loaded on the user device and the

conversation policy is installed on the user device (see claim 2 rejection above).

As per **claim 13**, which depends on claim 11, Lemon further teaches wherein the

user device is a personal computer (see claim 8 rejection above).

As per **claim 14**, which depends on claim 10, Lemon further teaches wherein the

policy archive and presentation archive are loaded on a remote machine and the

conversation policy is installed on the remote machine, the remote machine

communicating with the human-usable interface installed on the user device (see claim

3 rejection above).

As per **claim 15**, which depends on claim 10, Lemon further teaches wherein

said presentation support is obtained from another system (see claim 9 rejection

above).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 4, 7, 12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lemon et al. (US 2002/0188666) in view of Bandhole et al. (Us

2002/0059377).

As per **claim 4**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon does not explicitly teach

wherein the human-usable interface is a plug-in browser.

Bandhole teaches that the human-usable interface is a plug-in browser (see

page 4, [0043]: "plug-in").

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the system of Lemon in view of Bandhole so that the

human-usable interface is a plug-in browser. One would be motivated to do so because

Lemon teaches that the client is a web browser (see page 2, [0027]) and further teaches

that the conversation controller can be received from the Internet (see page 5, [0056]).

One of ordinary skill in the art knows that plug-in's are employed from the Internet for

enabling specific functional applications via the browser.

As per **claim 7**, which depends on claim 1, Lemon does not explicitly teach

wherein the user device is a personal digital assistant.

Bandhole teaches that the user device is a personal digital assistant (see page 3,

[0030] and page 4, [0041]: "PDA"). One would be motivated to do so because one of

ordinary skill in the art know that advancements in technology are enabling personal

computing functionalities to be employed in mobile devices such as a PDA, cell phones,

laptops, and the like.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Lemon in view of Bandhole so that the user device is a personal digital assistant.

As per **claim 12**, which depends on claim 11, Bandhole teaches wherein the user device is a personal digital assistant (see claim 7 rejection above).

As per **claim 16**, which depends on claim 10, Bandhole teaches wherein the human-usable interface is a plug-in browser (see claim 4 rejection above).

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed October 31, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claim 1, the applicant(s) assert that Lemon does not explicitly discuss the "conversation-enabled applications". The applicant(s) seem to be asserting that because Lemon does not identically recite the term that somehow this "conversation-enabled application" is not taught. Lemon teaches that the invention pertains to enabling "services to carry out an entire **conversation** without the service developer having to implement code to manage **conversation** logic" (see abstract and emphasis added). Therefore to assert that application, which is known to ordinary skill in the art, does not pertain in the Lemon patent to "conversation-enabled application" is an improper and erroneous assertion that gleans away from Lemon's invention.

The applicant(s) also assert that Lemon does not teach "the user device to show the user a state of the conversation and options for selection by the user" as recited in

claim 1. The examiner has cited new citations to better teach this limitation. In particular, Lemon teaches that the conversation controller may invoke client entry points and prompt the client for a given state of a conversation (see page 2, [0026]).

The applicant(s) assert that Lemon does not teach a "data input means installed on the user device by which the user selects and available option and fills in message content that conforms with the conversation policy in use by the conversation-enabled applications" as recited in claim 1. The examiner has cited new citations to better teach this limitation (see rejection above).

The applicant(s) argue that the limitations of claims 2, 3, 11 and 14 are not taught by Lemon. Fig.6 describes a computer that may be used with the conversation controller. Furthermore, Lemon teaches that the conversation controller can be embodied in any variation readily apparent to those skilled in the art (see page 5, [0058]) such as within client-side or server-side application.

Applicants(s) arguments with respect to claim 5 and claim 6 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Merely, stating that the reference locations do not teach the claim limitation is insufficient for the examiner to respond.

With respect to the argument regarding claims 8 and 13, Lemon teaches a computer that may be used with the conversation controller. Therefore, the broad limitation of a personal computer, a client device or the like is taught.

With respect to the argument regarding claims 9 and 15, Lemon clearly teaches all the limitation of claims 9 and 15 in Fig.3.

The applicant(s) argue with respect to claim 10, that Lemon does not teach, "loading a selected service device, said service including a policy archive and a presentation archive" and "installing a conversation policy supporting selected service". The recitations provided in the rejection set forth above clearly and explicitly teach the broad limitations recited.

The applicant(s) argue with respect to claim 10, that Lemon does not teach, "accessing the policy archive and communicating... ". The examiner has cited new citations to better teach this limitation.

The applicant(s) argue with respect to claim 10, that Lemon does not teach, "accessing the presentation archive and communicating... ". The examiner has cited new citations to better teach this limitation.

The applicant(s) argue with respect to claim 10, that Lemon does not teach, "prompting user to select and available option and fill in message content that conforms with the conversation policy in use by the conversation-enabled application". In response, the applicant(s) are directed to the responses to claim 1 arguments above.

In response to the argument regarding claims 4 and 16, and claims 7 and 12, Bandhole is only relied to teach the missing limitations (i.e., that the human-usable interface is plug-in browser, wherein the user device is a personal digital assistant, respectively). Lemon clearly and explicitly teaches all the other limitations with respect to claims 4, 7, 12 and 16.

Conclusion

7.   For the reasons above, claims 1-16 are rejected and remain pending. The

applicant(s) are encouraged to amend the broad claims to incorporate novel functional

limitations to expedite prosecution.

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael Y. Won whose telephone number is 571-272-

3993. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Won/

Primary Examiner

November 27, 2007